

Social Service PILOT and Comparative Impact Study Committee
Conference Room 1 7:30 PM Memorial Building Framingham, Ma

Minutes

January 17, 2006

Note: If a word or sentence is blue and underlined click for the link.

Note: A tape recording of these minutes is available upon request

Attendance: Bob Berman, Dawn Harkness, Cynthia Laurora., Laurie Lee, , Wes Ritchie,
Nick Sanchez: Steve Orr , John Speranza late: Jim Palmer, Yaakov Cohn

Meeting called to order by Chair Berman at 7:30 PM.

Review of Minutes

Motion to accept the minutes of 12/13/05 with changes.

second

Vote: 7 in favor 1 opposed 0 abstain pass

Motion to accept the minutes of 12/20/05 with corrections

Second

Vote: 8 in favor 0 opposed 0 abstain pass

1/3/06 minutes postponed for John to have a chance to review them

PILOT Study Committee Hearing Proposals

Submitted by Bob Berman, Chair

1/17/2006

Hearing 1: Public Input

Topic: "The Impact of Social Service Programs in Framingham"

Proposed Date(s): February 16th or February 23rd?

Time: 7:30 pm to 9:30 pm, with the end time being flexible to allow for additional input if needed.

Process/Format: Those wishing to speak will sign their name on a sign in sheet at the front table visibly labeled **Sign in Here if You Wish To Speak**. Speakers will be asked to come up and speak to the committee by the Chair. The Chair will work within his power to ensure that as broad a range of viewpoints are heard throughout the night.

Direct questions will be allowed from committee members to the speakers following initial comments, at the discretion of the Chair. Committee members wishing to ask a question of a speaker will do so only after being recognized by the Chair. Questions to the speakers must be relevant to the topic of the evening.

Each speaker will have a maximum of 5 minutes for their initial comments. Additional time may be granted by the Chair to allow for response to questions/comments by the committee.

Relevance of Comments: individuals making comments not pertinent to the topic ““The Impact of Social Service programs in Framingham” will not be allowed to continue, but will be given an opportunity to get back “on track”.

Advertising:

Press release to the MWDN and the Boston Globe. (also a letter to the editor from the Chair?)

Posting on the town website

Posting on cable access announcements

Messages to various email lists in the town

Additional Comment:

It is important to note that public hearings are just that, an opportunity for **the public** to offer their various viewpoints on the topic at hand.

Hearing 2: Social Service Agency Input

Topic: “Roundtable Discussion on the Impact of Social Service Programs in Framingham”

Proposed Date(s): March 2, 2006?

Time: 7:30 pm to 9:30 pm

Who: The PILOT Study Committee and invitees from various Social Service Providers operating in the Town of Framingham.

Process/Format: The meeting will be held as a roundtable forum, with all participants sitting in a circle or horseshoe setup of tables. Participants wishing to speak will raise their hands, and will have the floor when called upon by the Chair. The Chair recognizes the importance of back and forth conversation in a roundtable forum, and will allow that flexibility as deemed appropriate throughout the meeting.

Agenda:

I. Introductions.

II. Opening Remarks by the Chair, setting of ground rules (to be decided by the PILOT Committee in advance)

III. Opening Remarks by the guests in attendance. Five-minute maximum time allotted per speaker.

IV. Roundtable discussion of various topics including (this is to be discussed by the PILOT committee and distributed to the guests in advance):

(example topics)

-How do agencies go about siting a program?

-What are the tangible benefits to the town of the current social service programs?

-What are the tangible costs to the town of the current social service programs?

V. Additional topics as requested by agency representatives

VI. Closing remarks

Advertising:

-Invitations to the agencies outlining the roundtable event (including topics the committee wishes to discuss) and requesting participation.

-Press release to the MWDN and the Boston Globe. (also a letter to the editor from the Chair?)

-Posting on the town website

-Posting on cable access announcements

-Messages to various email lists in the town

Note: It should be clearly stated that public input will not be taken at this meeting. This will be highlighted in the opening remarks by the Chair.

Hearing 3. Future Idea: Payment in Lieu of Taxes roundtable with invitees from municipalities that have implemented or have studied PILOT payments from social service agencies. Also to be invited could be our legislators, reps. from the BoS, Town Counsel? This is just a working idea.

The chair introduced his proposal for the three hearings as requested by the committee.

Specific clarifications and changes to the format and ground rules for the hearing 1:

- Members may clarify points of speaker
- The issue of PILOT's may be discussed in the context of the impact of SSA's on the town of Framingham
- Date changed to 2/2
- Try to change room to Public Hearing Room
- Change speaking time to 3 minutes

To be determined: what are the requirements of disclosure by the public speakers?

Steve moved that we accept the proposal for Hearing 1 with the corrections and changes.

Jim second

Wes made an amendment to change the topic to The Work of the PILOT Committee
no second

Vote on Motion: 7 in favor 1 opposed 2 abstain pass

Advertising was discussed. Bob will deal with the MWDN and a letter to the editor. Laurie will take care of the town site, Dawn will deal with cable. Steve will send the press release out after it is voted on, to the email lists.

The potential of a large turnout was discussed and a possible lottery system was recommended.

We need a clock and a timer.

Suggest in advertisement that if there is a large crowd not everyone will be able to speak so please bring a written statement.

Details of how the meeting should be run, how to ensure fair representation etc. will be discussed next week.

Specific clarifications and changes to the format and ground rules for the hearing 2:

- The list of questions in the proposal includes examples. We can ask questions regarding the answers to the survey however it should not get turned into attack
- Have something specific on hand for the agencies
- Date to be 3/8 or 3/9. Room TBD
- One representative from each agency
- Cut off date for the response: 3/2
- This will be more open: we will be speaking for ourselves
- Change speaking time to 3 minutes

Advertising was discussed. Personal invitations will be include along with the other forms of notification.

Dawn moved that we accept the proposal for hearing 2 as amended and the meeting being either 3/8 or 3/9.

Second

Nick asked if it included the (inaudible) the answer was yes

Vote: 9 in favor 1 opposed 0 abstain Pass

Laurie moved that we take our list of social service agencies and send everyone an invitation to this event

Steve second

Vote: 8 in favor 0 opposed 2 abstain pass

We will address topics as it gets closer

Hearing 3, PILOT discussion, can be something we plan on in the future.

Laurie moved that we have a third hearing with the public which will be a presentation of the information from the individual committees to date or a draft report (possibly a phase I), on 3/23 or 3/30.

Second

Nick asked if there is a way to combine Jim Palmer's idea regarding the formal participation of town meeting members.

Laurie agreed

Laurie said we could gear this presentation towards town meeting members and the board of Selectman, similar to Hearing 2: we could also send individual invitations: as well as the other forms of advertisement.

Jim liked this idea and thought it would make the involvement of those who formed us proactive rather than reactive.

It was decided that this hearing can be handled exactly as hearing 2: it is advertised for the public to attend but you have to be an elected official of Framingham to participate in the discussion and feedback from the information.

Laurie agreed to this change.

Dawn asked if we could include appointed as well as elected officials. All agreed.

Laurie moved that we have a roundtable discussion on our information to committees to date, and if possible a draft report, with Framingham government officials, elected and appointed. The public will be invited; however interactions will be limited to the officials. The date will be 3/23/06.

Vote on Laurie's Motion for Hearing 3: 8 in favor 0 opposed 2 abstain

Education Questionnaire was sent out before the meeting. The rest will follow shortly.

Background

Laurie passed our more changes for the living list.

Wes moved to accept the list

Second

withdrawn

The group reviewed:

four removals: youth project, narrow path and Ma. Prevention

Discussion of Advocacy groups:

Change of count for Advocate to 61 unknowns

Inclusion of three properties for Learning Center.

Nick moved that Laurie be authorized to join Guidestar for one month so the background working group can have access to more detailed information.

second

Vote: 10 in favor 0 opposed 0 abstain pass

Discussion ensued about some details regarding the searching for addressed. Dawn asked if all the information from The Warren Group can be printed. She wanted verifiability.

Nick explained that some of the data they are getting from State agencies is massive and includes all types of non profits. They have to sift through those and determine which fits the does we use. However, the information is always available.

Laurie said that the one possibility the working group might ask of the committee is to do a focused study for the 17 other communities. The contiguous set is almost complete but the other list might be overwhelming.

Nick wasn't sure he liked that idea because he thinks it is doable if we just use State information for all the other comparative communities.

Dawn moved that we remove the removals and exclude advocacy groups and update the Advocate's number to the living list.

second

Vote: 10 in favor 0 opposed 0 abstain pass

Property & Income sent out the appraisal report

Bob reported about a meeting that he and Laurie had with the Fire Chief. He had similar concerns that the Police Chief: we were asking for a lot of information that if it were even possible to get the information, would take a significant amount of person hours. We discussed what his concerns were.

The incidents that come to the Fire Dept goes to the State and they do not have all/easy access to it. He will do the list of addresses for the past year, but getting information from that is hard.

He can give us town statistics, and for a few years back.

Dawn said we still need an answer to the question of the top 200 addresses. We do need it as a comparative..

He did discuss fees and they are uniform for all properties.

Dawn was uncomfortable with general statistics: there are many reasons for the cause of incidents.

Bob said it was clear it might not be definitive and directly connected.

The fire chief said that their staffing is mandated by the town irregardless of what is in town.

The Chief will send us some specific statistics and some State information and annual reports. After we go through these we he will be happy to come to speak to the group.

Update from town counsel that he is almost done with the SA report.

Guidelines for the 1/19/06 working session with Advocates, SMOC and Wayside were established.

The purpose is to speak about the questionnaire: their concerns with it, much like the meetings with the Police Chief, Fire Chief and Superintendent of Schools.

How can we get the information we are looking for but in an easier fashion. Can we take another look at the questionnaire from their point of view and make adjustments.

What Steve wanted to come out of the meeting was what information can they give us regarding costs and benefits to Framingham from their organizations.

Bob said we are discussing their concerns about the questionnaire and an opportunity to have a face to face discussion about the issues regarding the questions.

Bob wanted to bring up an issue. He noticed that the town moderator was on our email list and wanted to know from Steve why he is on it and if it is for the reason that he thinks he should be on it, Bob wanted to discuss including the BoS on it s well.

Steve said he would be happy to have the BoS on it.

Bob asked if MR. Noonan is on it because he is an appointing authority?

Steve said no. He was part of it from the formation of our committee as a tool for communication..

There was discussion about leaving him on.: Steve said Me. Noonan follows the committee's work and is interested in receiving the information.

He would be happy to put on any one of the BoS but needs to have them OK it. He doesn't put people on email lists without their permission.

Jim wanted to thank Laurie for the fabulous progress chart. He hopes we use it.

Laurie suggested other working groups submit details and changes.

Jim added that he would like to be present for the P&I group's discussion of the appraisal report. He thinks there are inaccuracies or misconceptions.

The group agreed to not hold a meeting school vacation week, 2/19 .

Motion to adjourn

9 in favor 0 opposed 1 abstain

Laurie Lee

Clerk